



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,813	02/07/2002	Harri Hyytiainen	602.364USW1	4784

22865 7590 04/10/2003

ALTERA LAW GROUP, LLC  
6500 CITY WEST PARKWAY  
SUITE 100  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55344-7704

EXAMINER
----------

TAYLOR, BARRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

1

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/071,813

Applicant(s)

HYYTIAINEN ET AL.

Examiner

Barry W Taylor

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher et al (5,907,603 hereinafter Gallagher) in view of Nagel et al (5,757,900 hereinafter Nagel) or Nolting et al (6,385,301 hereinafter Nolting).

Regarding claims 15 and 20. Gallagher teaches a database-driven automatic message accounting system and method that uses a plurality of tables to define the structure and formats of the call data blocks and the destination call or event records of a telephony system (Title, abstract). Gallagher also shows (figure 1) storing the

collected data to a memory device such as a storage disk (#14 figure 1). Gallagher even discloses that the data may then be copied from disk (#14 figure 1) to another storage medium such as magnetic tapes (#16 figure 1) so that each telephone company may receive call records with a number of unique and different formats (col. 1 lines 10-29, col. 3 lines 1-3). Gallagher teaches using a distribution function (#32 figure 2) to copy disk data (#14 figure 2) to a magnetic tape or to copy from one tape to another (see #16 and #16' figure 2).

Gallagher does not explicitly show wherein identification data identifying the computer is used.

Nagel teaches a system and method (columns 1-9) for single access database retrievals by reading data from an accessing data record stored in an index database (i.e. first database---310 figure 3) wherein the accessing data record contains at least an accessing number, pointers pointing to a data clusters (i.e. second database---330 figure 3). Nagel discloses that by using search key (i.e. pointers) allows for accessing stored data in a second database and facilitates the addition of new database fields (columns 3-4) verses prior art retrieval systems that require sequentially searching huge data records (column 1 line 1 – column 3 line 21). Nagel further shows using information about the date of last update to a given record (column 6 lines 9-12).

Nolting teaches AMA records having mapping information that translates the item of information to descriptive information, e.g. the translation maps a code from the record to a descriptive identifier for a switching office, a particular customer, an office equipment number, etc (column 6 lines 3-59). Nolting also teaches information about

difference between a first and second time when the completed call data was processed so as to create a "call-in-process" CDR (see column 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gallagher to use date of last update in view of Nagel or to use "call-in-process" as taught by Nolting for the benefit of keeping track of database information taught by Nagel or Nolting.

Regarding claims 16-18 and 21-23. Gallagher does not explicitly show the using name of directory, contents of directory or separate file for the identification information.

Nagel teaches a system and method (columns 1-9) for single access database retrievals by reading data from an accessing data record stored in an index database (i.e. first database---310 figure 3) wherein the accessing data record contains at least an accessing number, pointers pointing to a data clusters (i.e. second database---330 figure 3). Nagel discloses that by using search key (i.e. pointers) allows for accessing stored data in a second database and facilitates the addition of new database fields (columns 3-4) verses prior art retrieval systems that require sequentially searching huge data records (column 1 line 1 – column 3 line 21). Nagel further shows using information about the date of last update to a given record (column 6 lines 9-12).

Nolting teaches AMA records having mapping information that translates the item of information to descriptive information, e.g. the translation maps a code from the record to a descriptive identifier for a switching office, a particular customer, an office equipment number, etc (column 6 lines 3-59). Nolting also teaches information about

difference between a first and second time when the completed call data was processed so as to create a "call-in-process" CDR (see column 14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Gallagher to use date of last update in view of Nagel or to use "call-in-process" as taught by Nolting for the benefit of keeping track of database information taught by Nagel or Nolting.

Regarding claims 19 and 24. Gallagher also shows using removable medium (see removable medium 16 and 16' figure 2).

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W. Taylor whose telephone number is (703) 305-4811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technology Center 2600 customer service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

  
CURTIS KUNTZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600